



PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Reissue Application of

VINIK *et al.*

Serial No. 09/659,379
reissue of U.S. Patent 5,804,421

Filed: September 8, 2000

) Group Art Unit: 1653
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Examiner: H. A. Robinson

Atty. Dkt. No. 005126.00003

For: **High Level of Expression of INGAP in Bacterial and Eukaryotic Cells**

BRIEF ON APPEAL

Lisa M. Hemmendinger
Reg. No. 42,653

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Reissue Application of

VINIK *et al.*

Serial No. 09/659,379
reissue of U.S. Patent 5,804,421

Filed: September 8, 2000

)
Group Art Unit: 1653
)
Examiner: H. A. Robinson
)
Atty. Dkt. No. 005126.00003
)

For: **High Level of Expression of INGAP in Bacterial and Eukaryotic Cells**

BRIEF ON APPEAL

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Va 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellants submit an original and two copies of this brief.

Appellants filed the Notice of Appeal on October 21, 2003. On March 12, 2004, the Examiner mailed an Office Action in this application, setting a three-month period for reply. The Office Action maintained the two rejections that were appealed and did not set forth any new rejections. It is unclear what effect this Office Action has on the status of this appeal. If necessary, Appellants respectfully request reinstatement of the appeal.

Please charge any fee that may be due to our Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST	4
RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	4
STATUS OF CLAIMS	4
STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	4
SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION	5
ISSUE	6
GROUPING OF CLAIMS	6
ARGUMENT	7
A. Every limitation is material to properly construe claims 1-49 of the present application, claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095, and claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531.	
1. Each of claims 1-49 of the present application explicitly excludes a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.	
a. Independent claims 1, 13, 15, 23, 29, 45, and 47 explicitly exclude a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.	
b. The pair of primers recited in independent claim 21 amplifies an INGAP coding sequence that explicitly excludes the INGAP signal sequence.	
2. None of claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 or claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 teaches excluding a nucleotide sequence that encodes the INGAP signal sequence.	
a. Claims 1-8, 15, 16, and 18-22 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 1-18, 15, and 16 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 explicitly require a nucleotide sequence encoding the full-length INGAP pre-protein.	
b. None of claims 9-14, 17, 23, and 24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 or claims 9-14 and 17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 recites any particular portion of the full-length INGAP pre-protein coding sequence.	
3. The Examiner erroneously construed claims 1-49 of the present application to include a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.	

B. Application of the *Graham* factors compels the conclusions that claims 1-20 of the present application are not obvious over claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and that claims 1-49 of the present application are not obvious over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531.

1. The scope and content of the “prior art” do not teach or suggest excluding the signal sequence to achieve high levels of INGAP expression.
2. There are critical differences between the subject matter claimed in the present application and that claimed in Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531.
 - a. Claims 1-8, 15, and 16 and 18-22 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 1-8, 15, and 16 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 require a nucleotide sequence encoding the full-length INGAP pre-protein, whereas claims 1-49 of the present application explicitly exclude a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.
 - b. Neither claims 9-14, 17, 23, and 24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 nor claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 recite any particular portion of the full-length INGAP pre-protein coding sequence, whereas claims 1-49 explicitly exclude a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.
 - c. The Examiner has repeatedly mischaracterized the differences between the subject matter claimed in the present application and that claimed in both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531.
3. The hypothetical person of ordinary skill in the art would have known that the effect of excluding a signal sequence on protein expression is unpredictable.

C. The Examiner has not made any of the required three showings for a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

CONCLUSION

26

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this reissue application is Eastern Virginia Medical School of the Medical College of Hampton Roads, to which this application is assigned.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Claims 1-20 in the present application have been provisionally rejected as obvious over claims 1-24 in co-pending application Serial No. 09/717,095, which is a reissue application of U.S. Patent 5,840,531. Claims 1-49 of the present application have been rejected as obvious over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531. A corresponding rejection has been made in Serial No. 09/717,095 and has been appealed.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-49 stand rejected and are appealed.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 13-18, 23, 27, 29, 38, 45, 46, 48, and 49 were amended in the responses filed April 4, 2002 and October 30, 2002. The amendments have been entered.

An amendment is filed concurrently with this Appeal Brief to correct a minor clerical error in claims 16-18, 21, 23, 27, 29, and 45 (correcting the recitation of nucleotides “12-456” to “12-458”). The appealed claims as discussed in this Brief and as set forth in Appendix 1 reflect the correction.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

One embodiment of the invention is a recombinant construct for expression of a protein which stimulates islet cell neogenesis. Col. 1, lines 47-49.¹ The recombinant construct comprises a first nucleotide sequence encoding amino acid residues 27 to 175 as shown in SEQ ID NO:6 operably linked to a transcriptional initiation site and a translational initiation site; it does not contain a second nucleotide sequence encoding a signal peptide immediately 5' of said first nucleotide sequence. Col. 1, lines 52-60. Other recombinant constructs comprise a first nucleotide sequence encoding mature human INGAP consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4, the first nucleotide sequence being operably linked to a transcriptional initiation site and a translational initiation site, but do not contain a second nucleotide sequence encoding a signal peptide according to SEQ ID NO: 5 immediately 5' of the first nucleotide sequence. Col. 1, lines 52-60; col. 11, line 60, to col. 12, line 67.

Other embodiments of the invention are host cells comprising the recombinant constructs. Col. 2, lines 4-10. Still other embodiments of the invention are methods of producing biologically active Islet Neogenesis Associated Protein (INGAP) from the host cells. Col. 1, line 61 to col. 2, line 3.

The invention also provides a pair of oligonucleotide primers for amplifying a coding sequence consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4. Each of the oligonucleotide primers hybridizes to an opposite strand of a double-stranded INGAP template under conditions sufficient for amplifying. One of the oligonucleotide primers hybridizes to the 5' end of the coding sequence for mature human INGAP and the second oligonucleotide primer hybridizes to

¹ All references are to the specification of U.S. Patent 5,804,421.

the 3' end of the nucleotide sequence encoding mature human INGAP under conditions sufficient for amplifying nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4. Col. 11, line 60, to col. 12, line 67.

The invention also provides a method of making an expression construct for producing INGAP in a recombinant host cell. A transcription initiation site, a translation initiation site, and a coding sequence for mature human INGAP consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4 are linked to make an expression construct which is devoid of the signal sequence of the coding sequence of INGAP. Col. 11, line 60, to col. 14, line 36.

ISSUE

Application of the *Graham v. John Deere Co.* factors to properly construed claims compels the conclusions that claims 1-20 are not obvious over claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and that claims 1-47 are not obvious over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531.

GROUPING OF CLAIMS

The claims stand or fall together in the following groups:

- claims 1-20 and 23-48; and
- claims 21, 22, and 49.

ARGUMENT

Application of the *Graham v. John Deere Co.* factors to properly construed claims compels the conclusions that claims 1-20 are not obvious over claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and that claims 1-49 are not obvious over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531.

Claims 1-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-24 of co-pending application Serial No. 09/717,095. Claims 1-49 are rejected as obvious over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531. A proper analysis of the facts, however, reveals no legal or factual basis for the double patenting rejections.

- A. Every limitation is material to properly construe claims 1-49 of the present application, claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095, and claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531.

The question of whether either of the appealed obviousness-type double patenting rejections is correct cannot be answered without properly construing each set of claims: “Double patenting is altogether a matter of what is claimed.” *General Foods Corp. v. Studiengesellschaft Kohle GmbH*, 972 F.2d 1272, 1277, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1839, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 1992). It is a fundamental rule of claim construction that every limitation is material and that what is claimed is what is defined by the claim as a whole. *Id.* at 1280, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) at 1845.

- 1. Each of claims 1-49 of the present application explicitly excludes a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.

Claims 1, 13, 15, 21, 23, 29, 45, and 47 of the present application are independent. Construction of the independent claims is sufficient to illuminate the key differences between claims 1-20 of the present application and claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and between claims 1-49 of the present application and claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531.

a. Independent claims 1, 13, 15, 23, 29, 45, and 47 explicitly exclude a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a recombinant construct for expression of a protein which stimulates islet cell neogenesis. Independent claim 13 is directed to a method of producing biologically active INGAP using the same recombinant construct. Independent claim 15 is directed to a host cell comprising the same recombinant construct. The recombinant construct recited in claims 1, 13, and 15 comprises a first nucleotide sequence encoding amino acid residues 27 to 175 as shown in SEQ ID NO:6 operably linked to a transcriptional initiation site and a translational initiation site. SEQ ID NO:6 is the amino acid sequence of human INGAP. SEQ ID NO:6 includes amino acids 1-26, which is INGAP's signal sequence. See col. 2, lines 33-34 of U.S. Patent 5,804,421.

The recited recombinant construct explicitly excludes a particular recited nucleotide sequence, *i.e.*, a nucleotide sequence encoding the amino acids of the signal sequence of INGAP. See claim 1, lines 5-6; claim 13, lines 5-7; and claim 15, lines 3-5: “wherein a second nucleotide sequence encoding a signal peptide is not present immediately 5' of said first nucleotide sequence.”

Independent claim 23 is directed to a method of making an expression construct. The method recites linking a transcription initiation site, a translation initiation site, and a coding sequence for mature human INGAP consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4 to make an expression construct. “Mature” human INGAP does not contain a signal sequence. See U.S. Patent 5,804,421 at col. 4, lines 43-46: “This example describes the use of polymerase chain reaction to synthesize INGMAT (a construct which lacks the signal peptide sequence, *i.e.*, which encodes the mature protein).” Nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4 do not include a

nucleotide sequence that encodes the signal sequence of INGAP. See U.S. Patent 5,804,421 at col. 5, lines 34-37: “At the end of this step the sequence of the PCR product that contains both restriction sites minus the signal sequence and 5' UTR was as follows (SEQ ID NO: 4)” Claim 23 explicitly states that the resultant expression construct is “devoid of the signal sequence of the coding sequence of INGAP.” Claim 23, lines 4-5.

Independent claim 29 is directed to a recombinant construct. Independent claim 45 is directed to a method of producing biologically active INGAP using the same recombinant construct. The recombinant construct recited in claims 29 and 45 comprises a first nucleotide sequence encoding mature human INGAP consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4 operably linked to a transcriptional initiation site and a translational initiation site. Independent claim 47 is directed to a host cell comprising a recombinant construct. The recombinant construct comprises a first nucleotide sequence encoding mature human INGAP operably linked to a transcriptional initiation site and a translational initiation site.

The recombinant constructs recited in claims 29, 45, and 47 explicitly exclude a particular recited nucleotide sequence: “a second nucleotide sequence encoding a signal peptide according to SEQ ID NO: 5 is not present immediately 5' of said first nucleotide sequence.”

Thus, each of independent claims 1, 13, 15, 23, 29, 45, and 47 contains an explicit negative limitation that requires the absence of a particular recited element.

b. The pair of primers recited in independent claim 21 amplifies an INGAP coding sequence that explicitly excludes the INGAP signal sequence.

A corresponding negative limitation is inherent in independent claim 21. Independent claim 21 is directed to a pair of primers for amplifying a coding sequence consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4. As explained above, SEQ ID NO:4 in the present application is a nucleotide sequence lacking the 5' untranslated region and encoding mature human INGAP, *i.e.*, INGAP without its signal sequence.

Each of the claimed oligonucleotide primers hybridizes to an opposite strand of a double-stranded INGAP template under conditions sufficient for amplifying. The first primer hybridizes to the 5' end of the coding sequence for mature human INGAP. The second primer hybridizes to the 3' end of the nucleotide sequence encoding mature human INGAP. Hybridization takes place under conditions sufficient for amplifying “a coding sequence consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4.” Claim 21, lines 1-2.

The meaning of the term “consisting of” has long been understood to exclude any element not specified in the claim. *In re Gray*, 53 F.2d 520, 521, 11 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 255, 256 (C.C.P.A. 1931). Thus, the closed term “consisting of” in claim 21 means that the amplified sequence includes only the recited nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4, *i.e.*, a sequence that encodes mature INGAP without its signal peptide.²

² Appellants do not concede by this statement that they are not entitled to equivalents of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4.

2. None of claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 or claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 teaches excluding a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.

Proper construction of claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and of claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 reveals that none of these claims teaches excluding a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence. Claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 are reproduced in Appendices 2 and 3, respectively.

- a. Claims 1-8, 15, 16, and 18-22 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 1-8, 15, and 16 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 explicitly require a nucleotide sequence encoding the full-length INGAP pre-protein.

Claims 1, 2, 18, 19, and 22 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 are directed to isolated DNA molecules encoding a mammalian islet cell neogenesis associated protein (INGAP) which has the amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO:2. SEQ ID NO:2 is the amino acid sequence of full-length INGAP pre-protein (*i.e.*, including the INGAP signal sequence). Claims 3-5 and 20 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 3-5 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 are directed to vectors comprising the isolated DNA. Claims 6-8 and 21 of U.S. Patent 09/717,095 and claims 6-8 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 are directed to host cells comprising the vectors. Claims 15 and 16 of both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 are directed to methods of using the host cells to produce full-length INGAP pre-protein. Thus, each of claims 1-8, 15, 16, and 18-22 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 1-8, 15, and 16 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 recites a DNA molecule encoding the full-length INGAP pre-protein, including the signal sequence.

b. None of claims 9-14, 17, 23, and 24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 or claims 9-14 and 17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 recites any particular portion of the full-length INGAP pre-protein coding sequence.

Claims 9-11 of both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 are directed to nucleotide probes comprising at least 30 contiguous nucleotides of a sequence encoding INGAP; the INGAP has the amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO:2. Claims 12-14, 23, and 24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 12-14 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 are directed to isolated DNA molecules comprising at least 30 contiguous nucleotides of a sequence encoding INGAP; the INGAP has the amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO:2. Claim 17 of both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 is directed to an antisense construct of INGAP. The antisense construct comprises a promoter, a terminator, and a nucleotide sequence which encodes all or a portion of SEQ ID NO:2. The nucleotide sequence is between the promoter and the terminator and is inverted with respect to the promoter. None of claims 9-14, 17, 23, or 24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 or claims 9-14 and 17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 recites any particular portion of SEQ ID NO:2 that should be included or excluded in the claimed probes, DNA molecules, or antisense constructs.

3. The Examiner erroneously construed claims 1-49 of the present application to include a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.

Both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 claim DNA molecules encoding INGAP (claims 1, 2, 18, 19, and 22 of Serial No. 09/717,095; claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531), vectors containing the DNA molecules (claims 3-5 and 20 of Serial No. 09/717,095; claims 3-5 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531), host cells containing the vectors or the DNA molecules (claims 6-8 and 21 of Serial No. 09/717,095; claims 6-8 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531), and methods of producing INGAP using the host cells (claims 15 and 16 of both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531). Proper construction of each of these claims must include the fact that each claim recites a nucleotide sequence encoding the full-length INGAP pre-protein, including the signal sequence.

Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 also claim probes (claims 9-11 of both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531), antisense constructs (claim 17 of both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531), and DNA molecules comprising at least a portion of an INGAP coding sequence (claims 12-14, 23, and 24 of Serial No. 09/717,095; claims 12-14 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531). Proper construction of these claims must recognize the fact that none of them specifies a nucleotide sequence that encodes any particular portion of INGAP.

In contrast, the present application claims recombinant constructs (claims 1-12, 19, 20, and 29-44), host cells comprising the recombinant constructs (claims 15, 16, 18, and 47), methods of producing biologically active INGAP using the recombinant constructs (claims 13, 14, 17, 45, and 46), and methods of making expression constructs (claims 23-28 and 48). Each of the recited constructs explicitly recites a coding sequence for mature INGAP which lacks the signal sequence. Each of the recited constructs explicitly excludes a coding sequence for the

signal sequence. The present application also claims pairs of primers (claims 21, 22, and 49). The primers amplify “a coding sequence consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4” (*i.e.*, lacking a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence). Proper construction of claims 1-20 and 23-48 of the present application and of claims 21, 22, and 49 of the present application must include the fact that the claims exclude from their scope constructs containing a coding sequence for the INGAP signal sequence.

The Examiner has ignored the plain language of the claims throughout the prosecution of the present application. Contrary to the basic canons of claim construction, the Examiner asserts that use of the open term “comprising” permits her to ignore the claims’ explicit negative limitations. See the Office Action mailed March 12, 2004:

The issue here remains that the claims in the instant application recite the open language “comprising” in association with the recitation of “residues 27-175”, thus, **residues 1-26 are not really excluded as asserted by applicant.**

Page 3, line 23, to page 4, line 1, emphasis added. Addressing Appellants’ response after final rejection filed November 26, 2003, the Examiner states:

Again the argument is made that residues 1-26 of SEQ ID NO:2 in the copending application is [sic; are] excluded from SEQ ID NO:6 of the copending application, **which is not factual as the claim recites open language which would include those residues.**

Id. at page 4, lines 16-19, emphasis added.

The Examiner’s construction of claims 1-20 and 23-48 and of claims 21, 22, and 49 of the present application violates the fundamental rule of claim construction that all parts of the claim must be considered. *General Foods*, 972 at 1280, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) at 1845. There is no legal basis for ignoring the exclusion of the second nucleotide sequence from the constructs recited in independent claims 1, 13, 15, 23, 29, 45, and 47 or for ignoring the closed language of

independent claim 21. Absent a failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, every portion of the claim must be considered when determining whether an invention is obvious. *In re Duva*, 387 F. 2d 402, 407, 156 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 90, 94 (C.C.P.A. 1967).

There has been no rejection based on the negative limitations or closed language under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first or second paragraph; thus, the Examiner has acknowledged that these recitations are supported in the specification and are definite. Both the negative limitations and basis for the recitation “consisting of” have clear support in the present specification. *See* U.S. Patent 5,804,421 at col. 1, lines 58-60, and Examples 1 and 2.

In fact, the M.P.E.P. explicitly authorizes use of negative limitations provided the claim is otherwise clear:

A fundamental principle contained in 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is that applicants are their own lexicographers. They can define in the claims what they regard as their invention essentially in whatever terms they choose so long as the terms are not used in ways that are contrary to accepted meanings in the art. **Applicant may use functional language, alternative expressions, negative limitations, or any style of expression or format of claim which makes clear the boundaries of the present matter for which protection is sought.** As noted by the court in *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 160 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971), a claim may not be rejected solely because of the type of language used to define the present matter for which patent protection is sought.

M.P.E.P. § 2173.01, emphasis added. As noted above, the Examiner has not alleged that the negative limitations make claims 1-20 or 23-48 of the present application in any way indefinite. Nor has the Examiner alleged that the closed language of claims 21, 22, and 49 is indefinite.

The Examiner’s erroneous dismissal of the recited negative limitations of independent claims 1, 13, 15, 23, 29, 45, and 47 and of the closed language of independent claim 21 has prevented the correct analysis of the asserted double patenting rejections. “Double patenting is

based entirely on *what* is claimed, reading each claim as an entirety to determine what invention it defines.” *General Foods*, 972 F.2d at 1281, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) at 1845, emphasis in original.

B. Application of the *Graham* factors compels the conclusions that claims 1-20 of the present application are not obvious over 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and that claims 1-49 of the present application are not obvious over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531.

An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is analogous to an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 except that the disclosure of the cited patent is not considered prior art. *In re Braithwaite*, 379 F.2d 594, 600, footnote 4, 154 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 29, 34, footnote 4 (C.C.P.A. 1967). Thus, the double patenting analysis parallels an analysis under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). *In re Braat*, 937 F.2d 589, 592, 19 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1289, 1291-92 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is a question of law based on several factual inquiries:

Under § 103, the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved.

Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966). The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the results of the factual inquiries under *Graham*. M.P.E.P., 8th ed., § 2142. The *prima facie* case requires three showings:

First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Id. The Examiner has made none of the required three showings in either of the asserted double patenting rejections. Thus, both *prima facie* cases of obviousness fail.

1. The scope and content of the “prior art” do not teach or suggest excluding the signal sequence to achieve high levels of INGAP expression.

The first factual inquiry under *Graham* is to determine the scope and content of the prior art. 383 U.S. at 17. There is no “prior art” in an obviousness-type double patenting rejection; only the claims of the cited patent are available for use as the basis of the rejection. *Braithwaite*, 379 F.2d at 600, 154 U.S.P.Q. at 34.

As explained above, each of claims 1-8, 15, and 16 and 18-22 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 1-8, 15, and 16 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 recites DNA molecules encoding the full-length INGAP pre-protein, which includes the signal sequence. Claims 9-11 of both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 are directed to nucleotide probes comprising at least 30 contiguous nucleotides of a sequence encoding INGAP pre-protein; the INGAP pre-protein has the amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO:2, which includes the signal sequence. Claims 12-14, 23, and 24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 12-14 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 are directed to isolated DNA molecules comprising at least 30 contiguous nucleotides of a sequence encoding INGAP; the INGAP has the amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO:2, which includes the signal sequence. Claim 17 of both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 is directed to an antisense construct of INGAP comprising a promoter, a terminator, and a nucleotide sequence which encodes all or a portion of SEQ ID NO:2, which includes the signal sequence.

There is no recitation in any of claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 or claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 excluding a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.

None of the cited claims recites the mature, processed form of INGAP or contains a hint or suggestion that there is any benefit or advantage to excluding the signal sequence.

2. There are critical differences between the subject matter claimed in the present application and that claimed in Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531.

There are critical differences between the subject matter claimed in the present application and that claimed in Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531.

- a. Claims 1-8, 15, and 16 and 18-22 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 1-8, 15, and 16 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 require a nucleotide sequence encoding the full-length INGAP pre-protein, whereas claims 1-49 of the present application explicitly exclude a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.

There is no overlap between the subject matter of claims 1-49 of the present application and claims 1-8, 15, 16, and 18-22 of Serial No. 09/717,095 or claims 1-8, 15, and 16 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531. Each of claims 1-20 and 23-48 of the present application explicitly excludes a nucleotide sequence encoding amino acid residues 1-26 of SEQ ID NO:6 (*i.e.*, of the pre-protein). Each of claims 21, 22, and 49 of the present application contains closed language that limits the amplified sequence to one that does not contain a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence. In contrast, the constructs recited in each of claims 1-8, 15, 16, and 18-22 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 1-8, 15, and 16 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 explicitly

include a nucleotide sequence encoding the full-length INGAP pre-protein, *i.e.*, including the amino acid residues of the signal sequence (residues 1-25 of SEQ ID NO:2).²

b. Neither claims 9-14, 17, 23, and 24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 nor claims 9-14 and 17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 recite any particular portion of the full-length INGAP pre-protein coding sequence, whereas claims 1-49 of the present application explicitly exclude a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence.

The scope of claims 1-49 of the present application excludes a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence. Neither claims 9-14, 17, 23, and 24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 nor claims 9-14 and 17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 specify or suggest exclusion of any portions of a nucleotide sequence encoding full-length INGAP pre-protein. None of the cited claims points in any way to exclusion of the signal sequence.

c. The Examiner has repeatedly mischaracterized the differences between the subject matter claimed in the present application and that claimed in both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531.

Throughout the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner has incorrectly characterized the difference between the subject matter claimed in the present application and that claimed in either Serial No. 09/717,095 or U.S. Patent 5,840,531. First, in attempting to support the rejection of claims 1-20 over claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095, the Examiner ignored the plain language of claims 1-49 of the present application and mischaracterized the claimed subject matter:

² The number of amino acids in the signal sequence differs between the present application and Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 due to the difference in the assignment of the first codon. The present application discloses two methionine residues at the N-terminus of the pre-protein, whereas Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 disclose only one methionine residue at the N-terminus.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in the copending application are directed to a recombinant construct for expression of INGAP which comprises a nucleotide sequence that encodes the amino acids set forth in SEQ ID NO: 6.

Paper No. 14 at page 4, lines 1-4. The Examiner makes the identical assertion in the rejection of claims 1-49 over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531. *Id.* at page 4, lines 14-18. As explained above, however, none of claims 1-20 or claims 1-49 is directed to a nucleotide sequence encoding SEQ ID NO:6 (which includes the signal sequence). Each of the present claims explicitly excludes the portion of SEQ ID NO:6 that encodes the signal sequence.

Second, the Examiner erroneously compares recited sequences in sequence listings rather than comparing the properly construed claims. In the rejection of claims 1-20 over claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095, the Examiner compares SEQ ID NO:2 of Serial No. 09/717,095 to SEQ ID NO:6 of the present application and finds that they differ by only a single amino acid, a methionine:

Note that the co-pending application is directed to an isolated DNA molecule which encodes an INGAP protein set forth in SEQ ID NO: 2 and both sequences are identical with the exception of one residue (SEQ ID NO: 6 has an additional methionine in the beginning of the sequence.)

Paper No. 14 at page 4, lines 4-7. The Examiner makes the same assertion in the rejection of claims 1-49 over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531:

Note that the patented claims are directed to an isolated DNA molecule which encodes an INGAP protein set forth in SEQ ID NO: 2 and both sequences are identical with the exception of one residue (SEQ ID NO: 6 has an additional methionine in the beginning of the sequence.)

Id. at page 4, line 18 through page 5, line 1. But mere comparison of sequences in sequence listings does not accomplish a comparison of claimed subject matter. A proper comparison must

be made between the recited subject matter of the two sets of claims. “[A] double patenting rejection must rely on a comparison with the claims in an issued or to be issued patent.” M.P.E.P. § 804 (III). Moreover, all of the claim limitations must be considered. *General Foods*, 972 F.2d at 1280, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) at 1845.

If one compares the claims in each of the two sets of claimed subject matter, considering all of the recitations of the claims, one finds a much larger difference between the subject matter claimed in the present application and that claimed in Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 than the Examiner has acknowledged. Claims 1-20 and 23-48 of the present application explicitly exclude a nucleotide sequence encoding amino acid residues 1-26 of SEQ ID NO: 6 (*i.e.*, of the pre-protein). Claims 21, 22, and 49 of the present application are directed to pairs of primers that amplify “a coding sequence consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO:4” (*i.e.*, lacking a nucleotide sequence encoding the INGAP signal sequence). In contrast, each of claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 and claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 recites a nucleotide sequence encoding the pre-protein, *i.e.*, including residues 1-25 of SEQ ID NO:2. Thus the subject matter of the present application and that claimed in Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 is far more distinct and non-overlapping than a single methionine residue.

Third, the Examiner mischaracterizes the general subject matter of claims 21, 22, and 49 of the present application and claims 9-11 and 17 of both Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531:

Furthermore, the present application and copending application both claim probes, primers, and have claims directed to antisense strands which would render each other obvious.

Paper No. 14, page 5, lines 2-3. This statement is incorrect. Serial No. 09/717,095 and U.S. Patent 5,840,531 contain claims to probes (claims 9-11) and antisense constructs (claim 17), but not to pairs of primers. The present application has claims to pairs of primers (claims 21, 22, and 49) but not to probes or antisense constructs. Thus, the subject matter of claims 21, 22, and 49 does not overlap with that of either Serial No. 09/717,095 or U.S. Patent 5,840,531 in the manner the Examiner asserts.

3. The hypothetical person of ordinary skill in the art would have known that the effect of excluding a signal sequence on protein expression is unpredictable.

The third factual inquiry under *Graham v. John Deere Co.* is to resolve the level of skill in the pertinent art. 383 U.S. at 17. The person of ordinary skill is described in *Custom Accessories, Inc. v. Jeffrey-Allan Industries, Inc.*:

The person of ordinary skill is a hypothetical person who is presumed to be aware of all the pertinent prior art. The actual inventor's skill is not determinative. Factors that may be considered in determining level of skill include: type of problems encountered in art; prior art solutions to those problems; rapidity with which innovations are made; sophistication of the technology; and educational level of active workers in the field. Not all such factors may be present in every case, and one or more of them may predominate.

807 F.2d 955, 962-63, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1196, 1201 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

At the priority dates of Serial No. 09/717,095 and of the present application, the hypothetical person of ordinary skill would have been aware of all pertinent prior art relating to expression of cloned genes in heterologous host cells. The person of ordinary skill would have known that the effect of excluding a signal sequence in the protein to be expressed was unpredictable. This unpredictability is evidenced by the following three publications, each of which was enclosed with the response filed November 26, 2003.

Xu *et al.*, "The role of the leader sequence coding region in expression and assembly of bacteriorhodopsin," *J. Biol. Chem.* 270: 24858-24863, 1995, describes the deletion of a 13-amino acid signal sequence (leader sequence) in a rhodopsin protein. The deletion of the leader resulted in unstable mRNA and almost no rhodopsin protein production. See Abstract. Xu postulates that the loss of protein production is due to degradation of the mRNA.

Jarvis *et al.*, "Influence of different signal peptides and prosequences on expression and secretion of human tissue plasminogen activator in the baculovirus system," *J. Biol. Chem.* 268: 16754-16762, 1993, teaches that deletion of the native signal sequence of human t-PA (tissue plasminogen activator) failed to increase t-PA production in a heterologous system. Page 16759 and Figure 8. Replacement of the signal sequence with signal sequences from three different proteins also did not increase t-PA production. Jarvis concludes that other factors are involved in preventing high level production. See Abstract.

Berges *et al.*, "Combined effects of the signal sequence and the major chaperone proteins on the export of human cytokines in *Escherichia coli*," *App. and Env. Microbiol.*, 62: 55-60, 1996, teaches that various combinations of signal peptides and proteins provide variable and unpredictable results. Some combinations are several-fold more efficiently translated than others. Some combinations lead to rapid growth arrest followed by slow cellular lysis. See page 49, discussion. These variations in expression among constructs employing the same signal sequence demonstrate that the identity and nature of the protein linked to the signal sequence influences heterologous expression efficiency in ways that are not predictable and do not depend solely on the presence or absence of a signal sequence.

The hypothetical person of ordinary skill would have been aware of at least these three publications and would have known that the effect of a signal sequence on the expression of cloned genes in heterologous host cells was unpredictable.

C. The Examiner has not made any of the required three showings for a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Only when a *prima facie* case has been established does the burden shift to the applicants to provide evidence or argument in rebuttal. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the results of the factual inquiries carried out under *Graham* do not support a *prima facie* case that claims 1-20 of the present application are obvious over claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 or that claims 1-49 of the present application are obvious over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531. The Examiner has not made any of the required three showings for a *prima facie* case of obviousness in either of the double patenting rejections.

First, a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires a showing that the cited references themselves or the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art contain a suggestion or motivation to modify the reference teachings. M.P.E.P. § 2142. The problem the present invention solves is obtaining expression of copious amounts of INGAP protein from a cloned INGAP gene in a heterologous host cell. Neither Serial No. 09/717,095 nor U.S. Patent 5,840,531 even recognizes the problem of poor expression of the cloned INGAP gene in a heterologous host cell. Thus, neither Serial No. 09/717,095 nor U.S. Patent 5,840,531 teaches or suggests any ways to overcome the problem. There is nothing in the claims of either Serial No. 09/717,095 or U.S. Patent 5,840,531 that teaches or suggests that the nucleotide sequence

encoding the signal sequence should be removed. There is nothing in either set of cited claims that indicates that removal of the coding sequence for the signal sequence would lead to improved expression levels.

Second, a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires a showing of a reasonable expectation of success in making the modification. Even if *arguendo* there existed a suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings of claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 or those of claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 to exclude the signal sequence of the recited INGAP, those of skill in the art would not have had a reasonable expectation that such removal would have successfully increased expression levels. As discussed above, the prior art indicates that there is significant unpredictability in expressing proteins in a heterologous host cell. Deletion of a signal sequence could be deleterious, leading to an unstable mRNA. See Xu, *supra*. Deletion of a signal sequence could fail to increase production of a protein in a heterologous system. See Jarvis, *supra*. The identity and nature of the protein can affect the levels of expression in ways that were unpredictable at the time the invention was made. See Berges, *supra*. Thus, prior to the invention of the present application, it would not have been obvious that removing the signal sequence of INGAP would lead to increased production of INGAP in heterologous host cells.

Third, a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires a showing that the cited claims teach or suggest all the limitations of the rejected claims of the present application. Neither claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095 nor claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531 contain any suggestion to remove the amino acids of the signal sequence from the recited amino acid sequence. Thus, the cited claims do not teach or suggest all the elements in claims 1-20 or claims 1-49 of the present application.

The Examiner has made none of the required three showings for either rejection. Thus, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case that claims 1-49 of the present application are obvious. A *prima facie* case of obviousness would fail if any one of the required three showings failed. Indeed, the facts discussed above prevent the required showings.

CONCLUSION

The office actions in this application have repeatedly asserted that the claimed subject matter in the present application is an obvious variation of that claimed in Serial No. 09/717,095 or U.S. Patent 5,840,531. *See, e.g.*, Paper No. 19, page 5, lines 1-2. The office actions have never provided any analysis that compares the properly construed claims or developed any reasoning as to why the claims of one application would be obvious over the other. As the M.P.E.P. explains,

[m]erely asserting that two sets of claims are obvious over each other is insufficient to make a *prima facie* case. “Any obviousness-type double patenting rejection should make clear: (A) The differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims -- a claim in the patent compared to a claim in the application; and (B) The reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim in issue is an obvious variation of the invention defined in a claim in the patent.”

M.P.E.P., 8th ed., § 804 (II)(B)(1). Contrary to the clear instructions in the M.P.E.P. and in the law, the Examiner has erroneously compared sequences disclosed in each specification but has failed to compare the properly construed claims including all of their recitations. The Examiner has not made even a bare assertion of why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention of claims 1-20 is an obvious variation of that defined by claims 1-24 of Serial No. 09/717,095. Nor has the Examiner asserted any reason why a person of ordinary skill in the

art would conclude that the invention of claims 1-49 is an obvious variation of that defined by claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent 5,840,531. No basis for either conclusion exists in the facts.

The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences should reverse the obviousness-type double patenting rejections of claims 1-20 and claims 1-49.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: March 22, 2004

By: Lisa M. Hemmendinger
Lisa M. Hemmendinger
Registration No. 42, 653

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

APPENDIX 1. APPEALED CLAIMS

1. (twice amended) A recombinant construct for expression of a protein which stimulates islet cell neogenesis [Islet Neogenesis Associated Protein or INGAP activity] comprising:
a first nucleotide sequence encoding amino acid[s] residues 27 to 175 as shown in SEQ ID NO: 6 operably linked to a transcriptional initiation site and a translational initiation site, wherein a second nucleotide sequence encoding a signal peptide is not present immediately 5' of said first nucleotide sequence.
2. The construct of claim 1 wherein nucleotides 1-16 of SEQ ID NO: 1 are not present 5' of said first nucleotide sequence.
3. The construct of claim 1 further comprising a third nucleotide sequence encoding a histidine tag.
4. The construct of claim 3 wherein the third nucleotide sequence is immediately 5' or 3' to said first nucleotide sequence.
5. The construct of claim 1 wherein the transcriptional initiation site is inducible.
6. (once amended) The construct of claim 1 wherein the transcriptional initiation site is the lac promoter [/] and operator.
7. (once amended) The construct of claim 1 [further comprising a promoter sequence] wherein the transcriptional initiation site is capable of initiating constitutive transcription.
8. (once amended) The construct of claim 7 wherein the [promoter sequence] transcriptional initiation site is Rous sarcoma virus long terminal repeat (RSVLTR).
9. The construct of claim 1 further comprising a nucleotide sequence encoding a nuclear antigen.

10. (once amended) The construct of claim 9 wherein the nuclear antigen is Epstein-Barr nuclear antigen-1 (EBNA-1).

11. The construct of claim 1 further comprising an origin of replication.

12. The construct of claim 11 wherein the origin of replication is Epstein Bar Virus (EBV) origin of replication.

13. (once amended) A method of producing biologically active Islet Neogenesis Associated Protein or INGAP [protein] from a recombinant host cell comprising the steps of:

culturing a host cell comprising a recombinant construct comprising a first nucleotide sequence encoding amino acid[s] residues 27 to 175 as shown in SEQ ID NO: 6 operably linked to a transcriptional initiation site and a translational initiation site, wherein a second nucleotide sequence encoding a signal peptide is not present immediately 5' of said first nucleotide sequence, and

recovering protein from said cultured host cell.

14. (once amended) The method of claim 13 wherein the construct further comprises a third nucleotide sequence encoding a histidine tag, and INGAP [protein] is purified using a nickel affinity matrix.

15. (twice amended) A host cell comprising a recombinant construct comprising a first nucleotide sequence encoding amino acid[s] residues 27 to 175 as shown in SEQ ID NO: 6 operably linked to a transcriptional [iron] initiation site and a translational initiation site, wherein a second nucleotide sequence encoding a signal peptide is not present immediately [5+] 5' of said first nucleotide sequence.

16. (twice amended) The construct of claim 1 wherein the first nucleotide sequence encoding amino acid[s] residues 27 to 175 comprises nucleotides 12-458 [12-456] of SEQ ID NO: 4.

17. (twice amended) The method of claim 13 wherein the first nucleotide sequence encoding amino acid[s] residues 27-175 comprises nucleotides 12-458 [12-456] of SEQ ID NO: 4.

18. (twice amended) The host cell of claim 15 wherein the first nucleotide sequence encoding amino acid[s] residues 27-175 comprises nucleotides 12-458 [12-456] of SEQ ID NO: 4.

19. (previously presented) The construct of claim 1 wherein the transcriptional initiation site is selected from the group consisting of: λcl promoter, tac promoter, trp promoter, and tet promoter.

20. (previously presented) The construct of claim 1 which comprises a nucleotide sequence as shown in SEQ ID NO: 4.

21. (three times amended) A pair of oligonucleotide primers for amplifying a coding sequence consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO: 4, wherein each of said oligonucleotide primers hybridizes to an opposite strand of a double-stranded INGAP template under conditions sufficient for amplifying, wherein a first of said oligonucleotide primers hybridizes to the 5' end of the coding sequence for mature human INGAP and the second of said oligonucleotide primers hybridizes to the 3' end of the nucleotide sequence encoding mature human INGAP under conditions sufficient for amplifying nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO: 4.

22. (previously presented) The pair of oligonucleotide primers of claim 21 wherein one primer has the nucleotide sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 2 and one primer has the nucleotide sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 3.

23. (twice amended) A method of making an expression construct for producing INGAP in a recombinant host cell, comprising the step of:

linking a transcription initiation site, a translation initiation site, and a coding sequence for mature human INGAP consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO: 4, to make an expression construct which is devoid of the signal sequence of the coding sequence of INGAP.

24. (previously presented) The method of claim 23 further comprising linking to said coding sequence for mature human INGAP a coding sequence for a histidine tag.

25. (previously presented) The method of claim 23 wherein the transcription initiation site is inducible.

26. (previously presented) The method of claim 25 wherein the transcription initiation site is selected from the group consisting of the lac promoter/operator, the tac promoter, the trp promoter, the λcl promoter, and the tet promoter.

27. (three times amended) The method of claim 23 wherein the coding sequence for mature human INGAP is obtained by amplification of a coding sequence consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO: 4.

28. (previously presented) The method of claim 27 wherein the amplification is performed using primers having sequences as shown in SEQ ID NO: 2 and SEQ ID NO: 3.

29. (three times amended) A recombinant construct comprising:

a first nucleotide sequence encoding mature human INGAP consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO: 4, said first nucleotide sequence being operably linked to a transcriptional initiation site and a translational initiation site, wherein a second nucleotide sequence encoding a signal peptide according to SEQ ID NO: 5 is not present immediately 5' of said first nucleotide sequence.

30. (previously presented) The construct of claim 29 wherein nucleotides 1-16 of SEQ ID NO: 1 are not present 5' of said first nucleotide sequence.

31. (previously presented) The construct of claim 29 further comprising a third nucleotide sequence encoding a histidine tag.

32. (previously presented) The construct of claim 29 wherein the third nucleotide sequence is immediately 5' or 3' to said first nucleotide sequence.

33. (previously presented) The construct of claim 29 wherein the transcriptional initiation site is inducible.

34. (previously presented) The construct of claim 33 wherein the transcriptional initiation site is the lac promoter/operator.

35. (previously presented) The construct of claim 29 wherein the transcriptional initiation site is capable of initiating constitutive transcription.

36. (previously presented) The construct of claim 35 wherein the promoter sequence is Rous sarcoma virus long terminal repeat (RSVLTR).

37. (previously presented) The construct of claim 29 further comprising a nucleotide sequence encoding a nuclear antigen.

38. (once amended) The construct of claim 37 wherein the nuclear antigen is Epstein-Barr nuclear antigen-1 (EBNA-1).

39. (previously presented) The construct of claim 29 further comprising an origin of replication.

40. (previously presented) The construct of claim 39 wherein the origin of replication is Epstein Bar Virus (EBV) origin of replication.

41. (previously presented) The construct of claim 33 wherein the transcriptional initiation site is the λcl promoter/operator.

42. (previously presented) The construct of claim 33 wherein the transcriptional initiation site is the trp promoter.

43. (previously presented) The construct of claim 33 wherein the transcriptional initiation site is the tac promoter.

44. (previously presented) The construct of claim 33 wherein the transcriptional initiation site is the tet promoter.

45. (twice amended) A method of producing biologically active Islet Neogenesis Associated Protein (INGAP) from a recombinant host cell comprising the steps of:

culturing a host cell comprising a recombinant construct comprising a first nucleotide sequence encoding mature human INGAP consisting of nucleotides 12 to 458 of SEQ ID NO: 4 operably linked to a transcriptional initiation site and a translational initiation site, wherein a second nucleotide sequence encoding a signal peptide according to SEQ ID NO: 5 is not present immediately 5' of said first nucleotide sequence; and

recovering protein from said cultured host cell.

46. (once amended) The method of claim 45 wherein the construct further comprises a third nucleotide sequence encoding a histidine tag, and INGAP is purified using a nickel affinity matrix.

47. (previously presented) A host cell comprising a recombinant construct comprising a first nucleotide sequence encoding mature human INGAP operably linked to a transcriptional initiation site and a translational initiation site, wherein a second nucleotide sequence encoding a signal peptide according to SEQ ID NO: 5 is not present immediately 5' of said first nucleotide sequence.

48. (once amended) The method of claim 23 wherein the coding sequence for mature human INGAP encodes amino acid residues 27 to 175 as shown in SEQ ID NO: 6.

49. (once amended) The pair of oligonucleotide primers of claim 21 wherein the first of said oligonucleotide primers comprises nucleotides 12 to 31 of SEQ ID NO: 2 and the second of said oligonucleotide primers comprises nucleotides 13 to 32 of SEQ ID NO: 3.

APPENDIX 2. PENDING CLAIMS OF SERIAL NO. 09/717,095

1. (once amended) An isolated DNA molecule encoding a mammalian islet cell neogenesis associated protein (INGAP) [protein], wherein the INGAP [protein] has the amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 2.
2. (once amended) The DNA molecule of claim 1 [wherein the INGAP protein] which has the nucleotide sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 1.
3. A vector comprising the DNA of claim 1.
4. The vector of claim 3 further comprising expression control sequences, whereby said DNA is expressed in a host cell.
5. (once amended) The vector of claim 4 which comprises [a] an Epstein Barr Nuclear Antigen-Histidine (EBNA His) plasmid.
6. A host cell transformed with the DNA of claim 1.
7. A host cell transformed with the vector of claim 3.
8. (once amended) The host cell of claim 6 which is a cos7, African [cos7,African]Green Monkey kidney cell.
9. A nucleotide probe comprising at least 30 contiguous nucleotides of a sequence encoding a mammalian islet cell neogenesis associated protein (INGAP), wherein said protein has the sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 2.
10. (twice amended) The nucleotide probe of claim 9 wherein the nucleotide sequence encoding a mammalian INGAP [gene] has the sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 1.
11. The nucleotide probe of claim 9 wherein said probe is labeled with a detectable moiety.

12. (twice amended) [A] An isolated DNA molecule comprising at least 30 contiguous nucleotides of a sequence encoding a mammalian islet cell neogenesis associated protein (INGAP), wherein said protein has the sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 2, wherein said DNA molecule encodes a polypeptide which stimulates islet cell neogenesis.

13. (once amended) The DNA molecule of claim 12 wherein the sequence encoding the mammalian INGAP [gene] has the sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 1.

14. The DNA molecule of claim 12 wherein said molecule is labeled with a detectable moiety.

15. (once amended) A method of producing a mammalian INGAP [protein], comprising the steps of:

providing a host cell according to claim 6;

culturing the host cell in a nutrient medium so that the INGAP [protein] is expressed; and harvesting the INGAP [protein] from the host cells or the nutrient medium.

16. (once amended) A method of producing a mammalian INGAP [protein], comprising the steps of:

providing a host cell comprising the DNA molecule of claim 1;

culturing the host cell in a nutrient medium so that the mammalian INGAP [protein] is expressed; and

harvesting the mammalian INGAP [protein] from the host cells or the nutrient medium.

17. (twice amended) An antisense construct of a mammalian islet cell neogenesis associated protein (INGAP) gene comprising:

a promoter, a terminator, and a nucleotide sequence [consisting of a mammalian INGAP gene, wherein the gene] which encodes all or a portion of a protein as shown in SEQ ID

NO: 2, said nucleotide sequence being between said promoter and said terminator, said nucleotide sequence being inverted with respect to said promoter, whereby upon expression from said promoter an mRNA complementary to native mammalian INGAP mRNA is produced, wherein said mRNA complementary to native mammalian INGAP mRNA prevents translation of the native mammalian INGAP mRNA.

18. (once amended) The DNA molecule of claim 1 wherein the INGAP [protein] is from human.

19. The DNA molecule of claim 1 which comprises nucleotides 4 to 268 and 389 to 629 of SEQ ID NO:1.

20. A vector comprising the DNA of claim 2.

21. A host cell transformed with the vector of claim 20.

22. The DNA molecule of claim 1 which is a cDNA molecule.

23. The DNA molecule of claim 12 which is a cDNA molecule.

24. (once amended) The DNA molecule of claim 12 which encodes a portion of INGAP, wherein said DNA molecule encodes a polypeptide which stimulates islet cell neogenesis.

APPENDIX 3. ISSUED CLAIMS OF U.S. PATENT 5,840,531

1. An isolated DNA molecule encoding a mammalian islet cell neogenesis associated protein (INGAP) protein, wherein the INGAP protein has the amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 2.
2. The DNA molecule of claim 1 wherein the INGAP protein has the nucleotide sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 1.
3. A vector comprising the DNA of claim 1.
4. The vector of claim 3 further comprising expression control sequences, whereby said DNA is expressed in a host cell.
5. The vector of claim 4 which comprises a EBNA His plasmid.
6. A host cell transformed with the DNA of claim 1.
7. A host cell transformed with the vector of claim 3.
8. The host cell of claim 6 which is a cos7, African Green Monkey kidney cell.
9. A nucleotide probe comprising at least 30 contiguous nucleotides of a sequence encoding a mammalian islet cell neogenesis associated protein (INGAP), wherein said protein has the sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 2.
10. The nucleotide probe of claim 9 wherein the mammalian INGAP gene has the sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 1.
11. The nucleotide probe of claim 9 wherein said probe is labeled with a detectable moiety.
12. A DNA molecule comprising at least 30 contiguous nucleotides of a sequence encoding a mammalian islet cell neogenesis associated protein (INGAP), wherein said protein has the sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 2.

13. The DNA molecule of claim 12 wherein the mammalian INGAP gene has the sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 1.

14. The DNA molecule of claim 12 wherein said molecule is labeled with a detectable moiety.

15. A method of producing a mammalian INGAP protein, comprising the steps of:

providing a host cell according to claim 6;

culturing the host cell in a nutrient medium so that the INGAP protein is expressed; and

harvesting the INGAP protein from the host cells or the nutrient medium.

16. A method of producing a mammalian INGAP protein, comprising the steps of:

providing a host cell comprising the DNA molecule of claim 1;

culturing the host cell in a nutrient medium so that the mammalian INGAP protein is expressed; and

harvesting the mammalian INGAP protein from the host cells or the nutrient medium.

17. An antisense construct of a mammalian islet cell neogenesis associated protein (INGAP) gene comprising:

a promoter, a terminator, and a nucleotide sequence consisting of a mammalian INGAP gene, wherein the gene encodes a protein as shown in SEQ ID NO: 2, said nucleotide sequence being between said promoter and said terminator, said nucleotide sequence being inverted with respect to said promoter, whereby upon expression from said promoter an mRNA complementary to native mammalian INGAP mRNA is produced.

18. The DNA molecule of claim 1 wherein the INGAP protein is from human.
19. The DNA molecule of claim 1 which comprises nucleotides 4 to 268 and 389 to 629 of SEQ ID NO: 1.